

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the office action dated March 21, 2006.

The examiner has objected to the disclosure because of the updated status of related applications. The status of all related applications has been updated appropriately through amendment of the specification.

The examiner has objected to the oath and declaration. A new oath and declaration is submitted herewith.

The examiner has objected to claims 1-24 because they are prefaced in line 1 with [c1], [c2], ... [c24], etc. This application was originally filed under an older electronic filing system using the USPTO's Pasat software, which automatically numbered claims with square brackets in this format. At the time, this claim numbering format was the only claim numbering option allowed by USPTO-issued software. Regardless of the reason for the claim numbering format, claims 1-24 have been corrected appropriately and the [c1], [c2], [c24] preface has been deleted.

The examiner has rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject which the applicant regards as the invention due to a lack of clear antecedent basis. Claim 23 has been amended so that there is now clear antecedent basis.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chuah (6,285,665). Claims 1, 5, and 7-14 have been cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claims 2-4, 6, 15-16 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,285,665 (Chuah) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,747,968 (Seppala et al.). Claims 2-4, 6, and 15-16 have been cancelled. Regarding claim 24, claim 24 is

an apparatus claim that corresponds closely to method claim 17, which has been classified by the examiner as allowable if put in independent form. Claim 24 has been amended to comprise all the elements of amended independent claim 17, but in the form of an apparatus claim rather than a method claim. Accordingly, claim 24 is believed to be allowable in its currently amended form.

The examiner has indicated that claims 18-23 are allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, set forth in the office action. Claims 18-23 have been amended to overcome this rejection by adding proper antecedent basis for claim elements and are now believed to be allowable.

The examiner has indicated that claim 17 is allowable if rewritten to comprise all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 17 has been rewritten to include these limitations and is now believed to be allowable.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C. Krieger/  
Scott C. Krieger  
Reg. No. 42,768  
Tel. No.: (360) 828-0589